

How a Lone Gunman could Trigger a Constitutional Crisis in the US

by Jeremy James



We will continue to highlight the risks to which the United States is exposed. As weak as it may be, relative to its former glory, it is the only nation on earth that can delay the plan to create a New World Order. It is also the only nation on earth – aside from Marxist China – with a significant proportion of Bible-believing Christians. However one views its international standing, its sudden decline would mark the end of the 'old world order' – based on Christian principles – and an unparalleled opportunity to coerce all nations into a one-world system of government.

In a previous paper (**'The Hounds of Hell and US National Security'**) we discussed the two greatest structural threats to the well-being of the United States. We also surveyed in two earlier papers (**'A Startling Military Essay that seems to Predict a Coup by the US Armed Forces in 2012'** and **'Midsummer's Day, *Shattered Union*, and the World Financial Crisis'**) the damage that the US could incur from a Constitutional crisis, especially one based on the office of President.

In the first we addressed the possibility of a military coup. This had already been the subject of an award-winning essay by a member of the US military in 1992. The essay was written from the perspective of a military officer imprisoned after a fictional coup in 2012. The prisoner reflects on the factors that led to the coup. A constitutional crisis arose where the President was assassinated in 2012 and the Vice President 'refused' to take the oath of President. The power vacuum created by this crisis prompted a senior military figure to stage a coup and ensure ongoing political stability. Congress then passed an Act authorizing a national referendum to seek approval from the American people to legally install the new military leader as President. Due to various other disturbing events (not detailed in the essay) a majority of the American people voted in favour of the new leader. They feared for their property, their state entitlements, their medical care, and the possibility of widespread social unrest. Once installed as President the new leader placed the nation under martial law. Anyone who opposed him was defined as a 'terrorist' and imprisoned without trial.

In the second paper we examined a video game from 2005 called *Shattered Union*. It turns on the premise that the United States slips unexpectedly into civil war when a disputed Presidential election gives rise to intense social unrest, with widespread rioting and looting in cities across America. The count in the Electoral College resulted in a tie between the two main Presidential candidates. When Congress stepped in and arbitrarily picked a 'winner' the supporters of the losing candidate were extremely upset. In their eyes the election had been stolen. The new President was immensely unpopular, implementing martial law in the areas worst affected, and even subverting the Supreme Court in order to stay in office.

Both the essay of 1992 and the video game identified a Constitutional crisis, centered on the office of President, as a highly effective way of destabilizing the United States.

While the recent Presidential election – which was won by the most controversial candidate in modern history – did not result in a tie between the two main candidates as the video game had speculated, it has nonetheless given rise to a very strange and very real risk similar to that explored in the military essay of 1992.

The Risk

Legal pundits and other experts should be highlighting this risk in the mainstream media, but they are not. The risk is as follows:

The incoming President has no power of any kind under the Constitution until he takes the oath of office at his inauguration on Friday 20th January 2017. If for some reason he is unable to take the oath of office (due to serious illness or sudden death), there is no provision under the Constitution that would enable the outgoing President to remain in office while another election was held. The principal losing candidate – in this instance Mrs Clinton – would not have any entitlement under the Constitution to take office without first being approved through another electoral process. The same is true of the incoming Vice President-elect, Mike Pence, who could only take the office of President if Trump died after he was inaugurated. In the 228 years since George Washington took office, there has never been an occasion where the President-elect was unable to swear the oath of office. If Donald Trump is unable to do so, the matter would have to be referred to the Supreme Court for a decision. Neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives are empowered under the Constitution to resolve a problem of this nature. Presumably the Supreme Court would hand down a ruling in accordance with known Constitutional principles. This would likely enable the outgoing President to continue in office, despite the absence of an explicit Constitutional provision for such a contingency, until an urgent election could be arranged to select his replacement. It would be a very tense time for the nation, but a clear direction from the Supreme Court would almost certainly provide sufficient political stability while a fresh election was held. The Supreme Court played a similar role, albeit to a lesser degree, during the 2000 Presidential election when it handed down a ruling on the electoral process in Florida, which effectively gave the presidency to Bush ahead of Gore.

When the scenario is spelt out like this, the risk ought to be obvious. Unless the Supreme Court can address the matter speedily and confidently, a serious legal problem could quickly develop into a full-blown Constitutional crisis. That is where the risk lies – at present the Supreme Court has only eight members, four of whom are 'conservative' (appointed by Republican Presidents) and four of whom are 'liberal' (appointed by Democratic Presidents). There is therefore a real possibility that the Court could be split on this issue.

How is it possible that the most important Court in the land could be hamstrung in this manner? The answer is so bizarre that one has to ask whether the scenario we are considering has been engineered by a hidden hand. Here are the facts:

1. On 13 February 2016, Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia died under suspicious circumstances. Without even examining the body, the justice of the peace certified that he had died of natural causes. No autopsy was performed.
2. Within hours of his death, Senate Majority Leader, Mitch McConnell stated categorically that he would not even consider a nomination from the President to fill the position. He took the view – which had no precedent and no legal basis – that a Supreme Court vacancy could not be filled in an Election year but that it was the right of the next President to put forward nominations to fill the position.
3. The President submitted a nomination in respect of Judge Merrick Garland on 16 March but it was not considered by the Senate. Legal experts were stunned by Senator McConnell's refusal to hold a hearing to consider the nominee's suitability. Just as the President is obliged under the Constitution to submit a nomination, the Senate is required under the Constitution to provide "advice and consent". This it failed to do.



**Vice President Joe Biden, Mitch McConnell, and Pope Francis
(24 September 2015)**

The Appointments Clause of the Constitution is very straightforward. It does not impose a limit of any kind on the President's power to fill vacancies on the federal bench. There is therefore no legal basis for what Senator McConnell decided to do. Indeed, in a properly functioning democracy he would have been impeached for this breach of established Constitutional practice.

According to a report in 2015 by the Congressional Research Service the average elapsed time between nomination and confirmation for a Supreme Court justice is a little over two months. A law school professor at the University of Denver was highly critical of this failure by the Senate: "It would be a monumental crisis for the development of the law and the need to resolve large legal questions."

The premature death of an incoming President would certainly qualify as a "large legal question" from which a "monumental crisis" could develop.

Dereliction of its Constitutional duty by the Senate

In order to justify what they were doing, the Senate Majority Leader made up a rule which has no basis in fact. They called this the *Biden Rule* in an attempt pass responsibility for this debacle onto the Democrats. The so-called rule is based on a speech that Senator Joe Biden (now Vice President) gave on the floor of the house in 1992, but the situation that he was speaking about – where a Supreme Court justice might suddenly decide to retire a few months before a presidential election – could not possibly apply where the vacancy arose due to the death of an incumbent.

A poll showed that 56 percent of Americans wanted the Supreme Court vacancy to be filled by a nominee put forward by President Obama. Another poll, on behalf of the Alliance for Justice Action Campaign, revealed that 69 percent of Americans believe the Republicans should have held a hearing and a timely vote on the President's nominee.



US Supreme Court before Justice Scalia's unexpected demise.

In all 13 Presidents filled Supreme Court vacancies during an election year:

George Washington (1796)
Thomas Jefferson (1804)
Andrew Jackson (1836)
Abraham Lincoln (1864)
Ulysses S. Grant (1872)
Rutherford Hayes (1880)
Grover Cleveland (1888)
Benjamin Harrison (1892)
William Taft (1912)
Woodrow Wilson (1916)
Herbert Hoover (1932)
Franklin D. Roosevelt (1940)
Ronald Reagan (1988)

Even more significant is the fact that the Senate approved the filling of six Supreme Court vacancies with nominees put forward by "lame duck" Presidents, that is after the incumbent President had been voted out of office and before the newly-elected President had been inaugurated.

Article II, Section 2 of the Constitution assigns to the Senate the duty to provide "advice and consent" on any person whom the President nominates to fill a Supreme Court vacancy. To refuse to give that advice and consent by not holding a hearing or vote on a nominee is a dereliction of that Constitutional duty – a point endorsed by over 350 law professors in a letter organized by Alliance for Justice. It should also be noted that Democratic senators have never attempted to scuttle high court nominations in this manner. On eleven consecutive occasions a Democratic senate voted to confirm a Republican-appointed nominee.



Donald Trump makes the 666 sign in virtually all of his speeches. He has even made it simultaneously with both hands on a few occasions. This example is from his speech at a rally in Delaware, Ohio, on 20 October 2016.



The Growing Tensions

Already we are seeing references on the Internet to the possibility that Donald Trump could be assassinated. His views have incensed several minority groups, some of which have gun-toting radicals among their ranks. It is probably fair to say that there has never been a President-elect whose rise to the highest office in the land has provoked such acrimony and division.

The public was given a glimpse behind this reality when, on 6 November, two days before the election, Trump was bundled off stage by his security detail when they spotted what they thought was a gunman in the audience.

If he were assassinated a week or so before his inauguration, there would be little or no time to fill the Supreme Court vacancy before President Obama's term of office expired. The crisis, with its grave ramifications, would develop from there. [A related scenario, where Obama was assassinated before *he* left office, is more difficult to quantify, but could be almost as traumatic.]

Whether a Trump assassination would result in a military coup, as envisaged in the 1992 essay, is impossible to say. Who knows what the military would do. However, if the crisis had been engineered from the outset, then a coup could be expected.



Trump is bundled off stage by his bodyguards, 6 November 2016

CONCLUSION

A lone gunman could throw the US into a major political crisis.

The Ruling Elite have been planning something like this for some time. All of the necessary preparations for the creation a New World Order have been made. The National Defense Authorization Act of 2012 provides for the arrest and indefinite detention of American citizens without trial during a state of national emergency. It also designates the US itself as a potential war zone for military purposes. Furthermore, the powers of the US President during a 'national emergency' have been greatly expanded over the past few years. The various Executive Orders signed by Obama and his predecessors have given the President the power to bypass Congress and rule by decree during a national emergency. He can take full executive control over all aspects of the economy, including energy, transport, communications, food distribution, labor, healthcare, media, manufacturing, agriculture etc. These powers are in addition to those of Commander-in-Chief. He would in effect have the same discretionary authority normally exercised only by a dictator.

Many see Donald Trump as the great hope for America. He is the blond hero of legend who strides boldly into view and seizes victory from the jaws of defeat. If he were assassinated by a lone gunman – the assassination could be faked – the hope of millions of Americans would be dashed. Their morale would collapse and a terrible fear would grip the nation, not unlike the fear generated by 9/11.

The Illuminati like to use fear and demoralization to subdue a nation, to break its spirit and shatter resistance to whatever plan they want to impose.

The puppets sit beside their puppet master



Hilary Clinton and Donald Trump dining in public with Cardinal Timothy Dalton, the most senior Roman Catholic cleric in the United States (20 Oct 2016).

The Constitutional crisis would follow immediately on its heels, adding greatly to the nation's sense of helplessness. If this were to drag out for several months, aggravated perhaps by random acts of terrorism, cyber attacks on the banking system, and civil unrest in major cities, the people of America – fearing an even greater escalation of the crisis – would likely welcome a 'temporary' military dictatorship or junta to restore order and protect property.

Does any of this sound purely speculative? The Executive Orders are real. The Supreme Court's vulnerability is real. The risk of a Trump assassination is real. The inexplicable refusal by the Senate to consider a nominee is real. The threats of terrorism, cyber attacks, and civil unrest are real. And if these are real, the ensuing crisis would be just as real.

In closing we need to remember that this is just an option, albeit a very enticing one for the architects of the New World Order. However it has become a little too transparent and they may decide not to use it and allow Trump to assume the Presidency. After all, he is their man and will do their bidding. As a maverick operator and, in political terms, an unknown quantity, he will provide even greater scope than the defeated candidate for the implementation of bizarre and irrational policy decisions that will destabilize America.

Whatever happens, it ought to be patently clear that, given their treatment of the Supreme Court, the Ruling Elite have nothing but contempt for the Constitution and the security of the United States.

"They encourage themselves in an evil matter: they commune of laying snares privily; they say, Who shall see them? They search out iniquities; they accomplish a diligent search: both the inward thought of every one of them, and the heart, is deep."

– Psalm 64:5-6

**Jeremy James
Ireland
12 November 2016**

For further information visit www.zephaniah.eu

Copyright Jeremy James 2016